

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## VOLUME I FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Table of Contents .....	i
List of Tables.....	ii
List of Figures .....	iii
Volume II – Mitigation Plan .....	iii
List of Acronyms.....	iv
General Comment Tracking Index.....	vi
 Summary .....	 S- 1
S.1 Introduction .....	S- 1
S.2 Purpose and Need .....	S- 2
S.2.1 Project Need .....	S- 2
S.2.2 Project Objectives .....	S- 2
S.3 Alternatives Studied in Detail Including the Applicant’s Proposal .....	S- 4
S.3.1 No-Action Alternative.....	S- 4
S.3.2 Applicant’s Proposal – Enstar Route .....	S- 6
S.3.3 Tesoro Route Alternative .....	S- 6
S.3.4 Project Facilities .....	S- 7
S.3.5 Construction Seasons .....	S- 8
S.4 Alternatives Eliminated from Detailed Study .....	S- 8
S.4.1 Alternatives to a New Transmission Line Eliminated.....	S- 8
S.4.2 Alternative Transmission Systems Eliminated .....	S- 9
S.4.3 Alternative Transmission Routes Eliminated.....	S-10
S.5 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences.....	S-11
S.6 Scoping, Consultation, and Coordination on the DEIS.....	S-24
S.7 Public Comments on DEIS .....	S-24
S.8 Supplemental Discussion on Key Issues .....	S-25
S.9 Mitigation Plan.....	S-25
S.10 Agency Preferences and Decision to be Made.....	S-26
S.10.1 RUS Preferred Alternative .....	S-26
S.10.2 USFWS Preferred Alternative.....	S-26
S.10.3 USACE Least Damaging Practicable Alternative.....	S-26
S.10.4 Decisions to be Made .....	S-26
 Chapter 1 – Public Comments and Responses .....	 1- 1
1.1 Introduction .....	1- 1
1.2 Public Review Process .....	1- 1
1.3 Comment Analysis Summary.....	1- 2
1.3.1 List of Key Topics and Issues .....	1- 2
1.3.2 Responses to Written Comments .....	1-10

## Table of Contents (continued)

1.3.3	Responses to Verbal Comments.....	1-13
Chapter 2 –	Supplemental Information .....	2- 1
2.1	Introduction .....	2- 1
2.2	Supplemental Information.....	2- 1
2.2.1	Project Costs and Benefits.....	2- 1
2.2.2	Cost and Technical Comparison Discussion of Route Options .....	2- 4
2.2.3	Underground Construction Costs .....	2-11
2.2.4	Battery Energy Storage Systems .....	2-14
2.2.5	Update on Beluga Whales .....	2-17
2.2.6	Update on Kenai Peninsula Brown Bears and Wolverines .....	2-18
2.2.7	Environmental Cost-Benefit Analysis Summary .....	2-21
2.2.8	Avian Collision Mitigation.....	2-32
2.3	Updated Information and Corrections.....	2-34
Appendices		
A	USFWS Compatibility Determination	
B	USACE Draft Section 404 (b)(1) Evaluation	
C	Public Notices	

## LIST OF TABLES

S-1	ASCC Planning and Operating Criteria.....	S- 3
S-2	Summary Comparison of Alternatives .....	S-17
S-3	Project Issues and Relative Degree of Concern.....	S-25
1-1	Project Issues and Relative Degree of Concern.....	1- 3
1-2	Guide to Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals Who Provided Written Comments on DEIS .....	1-10
1-3	Guide to Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals Who Provided Verbal Comments on DEIS.....	1-13
2-1	Summary of Costs and Cost/Benefit Ratios .....	2- 2
2-2	Summary of Life Cycle Costs by Route Option.....	2- 3
2-3	Tesoro Route Alternatives Pt. Possession to Pt. Woronzof Substation.....	2- 5
2-4	Tesoro Alternative Comparison of Cost/Technical Factors .....	2- 8
2-5	Enstar Route Alternatives Soldotna North and South Route Options .....	2- 9
2-6	Enstar Route Alternatives South Shore Turnagain Arm to International Substation ..	2-10
2-7	Comparison of Overhead Versus Underground Through KNWR .....	2-13

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

S-1	Alternatives Studied in Detail.....	S- 5
-----	-------------------------------------	------

## VOLUME II MITIGATION PLAN

---

1.0	Introduction .....	1
2.0	Mitigation Plan.....	1
2.1	Standard Practice Project Mitigation.....	2
2.2	Selective Mitigation Measures .....	2
2.3	Design and Construction Mitigation .....	10
2.3.1	Proposed Structure Types and Existing Utilities.....	10
2.3.2	Construction Season .....	10
2.3.3	Construction Methods and Access .....	10
2.4	Selective Mitigation Measure Locations .....	11
2.4.1	Selective Mitigation Data.....	11
2.5	Impact Mitigation Summary .....	11

## ACRONYMS

AC	alternating current
ADF&G	Alaska Department of Fish and Game
AML&P	Anchorage Municipal Light and Power
ANCSA	Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act
ANILCA	Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act
ASCC	Alaska Systems Coordinating Council
B/C	benefit/cost
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis
CBA	cost-benefit analysis
CEA	Chugach Electric Association
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CVM	contingent valuation method
CWG	Community Working Group
DC	direct current
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DNR	Department of Natural Resources
DSM	Demand-Side Management
EIS	environmental impact statement
EMF	electric and magnetic fields
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FEIS	Final EIS
GVEA	Golden Valley Electric Association
HEA	Homer Electric Association
HVAC	high voltage alternating current
IPG	Intertie Participants Group
ISER	Institute of Social and Economic Research
KNWR	Kenai National Wildlife Refuge
KPB	Kenai Peninsula Borough
kV	kilovolt

MEA	Matanuska Electric Association
MW	megawatt
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NERC	North American Electric Reliability Council
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
Project	Southern Intertie Transmission Line Project
RUS	Rural Utilities Service
SRA	State Recreation Area
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

## GENERAL COMMENT TRACKING INDEX

The Southern Intertie Project FEIS provides responses to comments received on the DEIS. To assist reviewers, the following General Comment Tracking Index provides references to where responses may be found in the DEIS and FEIS to the general topics of comments that have been received from agencies, special interest groups and individual members of the public. The index includes a Summary of Comments Received, and the DEIS and FEIS Response Index, which have been organized by the 14 issue topics that were identified in the DEIS. Specific responses to each of the comments received are provided in Chapter 1.

GENERAL COMMENT TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	Summary of Comments Received	DEIS and FEIS Response Index
<b>1</b>	<b>Purpose and Need for the Project</b>	<p>The underlying need for the Project has been questioned in several comments as summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The no-action alternative should be selected because the purpose and need had not been firmly established.</li> <li>■ There are other alternatives to a new transmission line that would meet the purpose and need with less environmental impact.</li> <li>■ The Project cost-benefit analysis should include long-term environmental costs associated with impacts to wildlife, recreation, and other resource values on the KNWR.</li> <li>■ The cost-benefit ratio is obscured by the inclusion of the state grant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 1, pgs. 1-3 and 1-4</li> <li>■ DEIS, Section 1.3, Purpose and Need for the Project, pgs. 1-13 to 1-29</li> <li>■ DEIS, Section 2.3.1, No Action Alternative, pages 2-29 and 2-30</li> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 14, pgs. 1-8 and 1-9</li> <li>■ DEIS, Section 2.2, Alternatives Studied and Eliminated from Detailed Study, pgs. 2-1 to 2-25</li> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 13, pg. 1-8</li> <li>■ FEIS, Section 2.2.7, Environmental Cost-Benefit Analysis Summary, pgs. 2-21 to 2-32</li> <li>■ FEIS, Section 2.2.1, Project Costs and Benefits, pgs. 2-1 to 2-4</li> <li>■ DEIS, Section 1.4.1, Construction and Life Cycle Costs, Table 1-12, pg. 1-31</li> <li>■ DEIS, Section 1.2, Project Background, pg 1-1 to 1-13</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>Urban and Rural Land Use</b>	<p>Comments were received on how the proposed and alternative routes could potentially conflict with existing or future land uses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 2, pg. 1-4</li> <li>■ DEIS, Section 3.6.3, Land Use and Recreation, Alternatives, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, pgs. 3-135 to 3-148</li> <li>■ FEIS, Volume II, Mitigation Plan</li> </ul>

GENERAL COMMENT TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	Summary of Comments Received	DEIS and FEIS Response Index
3	Aviation Safety	Because many areas near the proposed project are accessible only by aircraft, the concern was expressed that an overhead transmission line would prohibit landing of private aircraft in remote areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 3, pg. 1-4</li> <li>■ DEIS, Section 3.6.2, Land Use – Aviation, pgs. 3-132 to 3-134</li> <li>■ See Section 3.6.3, Land Use, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences of Alternatives, pgs. 3-135 to 3-148</li> <li>■ FEIS, Volume II, Mitigation Plan</li> </ul>
4	Recreation and Tourism	Concern was expressed that the Project would impact recreation and tourism on the Kenai Peninsula either by changing the visual quality of an area and therefore preventing people from wanting to visit, or by increasing access to an area, which could either result in difficulty managing the area or closing access entirely to prevent too much human contact with sensitive species.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 4, pg. 1-5</li> <li>■ DEIS, Section 3.7.1, Long Term Tourism and Recreation Impacts, pgs. 3-184 to 3-185</li> </ul>
5	Management Plans	<p>The majority of the comments received expressed concern that the proposed project would conflict with existing management plans (in association with Issues 8 – Biology, and 14 – Alternatives), on the KNWR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Concerned that the proposed Enstar Route would conflict with the mandate to protect wildlife within the KNWR</li> <li>■ The presence of a transmission line would impact wildlife by increasing access and preventing prescribed burning, which is critical for moose habitat, and will effect subsistence hunting.</li> <li>■ The presence of a new transmission line in the KNWR would prohibit future designation as a wilderness area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 5, pg. 1-5</li> <li>■ DEIS, Section 3.6.3, Land Use, Alternatives, Enstar to Chickaloon Bay, pgs. 3-142 to 3-145</li> <li>■ FEIS, Appendix A, USFWS Compatibility Determination (June 2002)</li> <li>■ DEIS Section 3.8 Subsistence, pg. 3-205</li> </ul>

GENERAL COMMENT TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	Summary of Comments Received	DEIS and FEIS Response Index
6	<b>Watershed Management and Soil Erosion</b>	<p>There are numerous streams and rivers in the Project study area, which provide food sources for many species such as the brown bear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that construction activities could damage water quality or cause soil erosion, which could in turn impact feeding activities or fish spawning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FEIS Section 1.3.1, Issue 6, Pg. 1-5</li> <li>DEIS Section 3.3.2, Water Resources, pg. 3-12 to 3-14; and Section 3.3.3, Alternatives, pg. 3-14 to 3-23 (including Table 3-2, Impacts and Mitigation Common to Most Alternative Routes, pg. 3-15).</li> <li>DEIS Section 3.5.5, Freshwater Environment, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation, Anadromous Fish (pg. 3-100).</li> <li>FEIS, Volume II, Mitigation Measures including specific locations of the anadromous streams crossed by the Project alternatives</li> </ul>
7	<b>Visual Resources</b>	<p>Several comments were received on visual resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specifically on how the Project would effect views in recreational areas, and</li> <li>Views from residences.</li> <li>Vegetation clearing and the presence of the transmission structures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issues 7, pg. 1-6</li> <li>DEIS, Section 3.9.2, Visual, Alternatives, pgs. 3-236 to 3-263</li> <li>FEIS, Volume II, Mitigation Plan</li> </ul>
8	<b>Biology</b>	<p>The combination of comments related to Issues 8 – Biology, 5 – Management Plans, and 14 – Alternatives, constitute the most frequently mentioned topics, primarily related to impacts to the KNWR and alternatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the comments focused on potential impacts on the KNWR resulting from the Enstar Route. These impacts could result from increased access and associated increase in hunting or bear/human contact, and restrictions in prescribed burns that would impact habitat.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 8, pg. 1-6</li> <li>DEIS, Section 3.5, Biological Resources, Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, pgs. 3-35 to 3-119</li> <li>FEIS, Chapter 2, Section 2.2.5, Update on Beluga Whales, pgs. 2-17 to 2-18</li> <li>FEIS, Section 2.2.6, Update on Kenai Peninsula Brown Bears and Wolverines, pgs. 2-18 to 2-20</li> </ul>



GENERAL COMMENT TRACKING INDEX			
	Issue	Summary of Comments Received	DEIS and FEIS Response Index
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Comments primarily focused on brown bears, moose, beluga whales, and wetland habitats, although other sensitive animal species (such as birds and waterfowl) or habitats also were mentioned.</li> <li>■ Comments on potential conflicts with beluga whales, especially during calving season, focused on the submarine cable installation in Cook Inlet.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ FEIS, Section 2.2.8, Avian Collision Mitigation, Pg. 2-32 to 2-34</li> <li>■ FEIS, Appendix A, USFWS Compatibility Determination</li> <li>■ FEIS, Appendix B, USACE Draft Section 404(b)(1) Evaluation</li> <li>■ FEIS, Volume II, Mitigation Plan</li> </ul>
9	Cultural Resources	Comments on the DEIS regarding cultural resources were limited to concerns regarding impacts to the Pt. Possession Village and native lands.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 9, pg. 1-7</li> <li>■ DEIS Section 3.6.3, Alternatives, Bernice Lake to Pt. Possession – Route Option A (pg. 3-135).</li> <li>■ DEIS, Volume II, Appendix B, “Access to Area” Table (pg. B-29)</li> <li>■ FEIS, Volume II, Mitigation</li> </ul>
10	Right-of-Way Limitations	Comments were received regarding concern that the additional right-of-way needed for the Project would impact property owned by an individual or agency.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 10, pg. 1 - 7</li> <li>■ DEIS, Section 3.6.3, Land Use and Recreation, Alternatives, pg. 3-135 to 3-148</li> <li>■ DEIS Section 2.5.2, Right-of-Way Acquisition Process (pg. 2-51)</li> <li>■ FEIS, Volume II, Mitigation Plan</li> </ul>
11	Health and Safety	One comment was received on potential health impacts (i.e., EMF) from the proposed project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 11, pg. 1-7</li> <li>■ DEIS, Section 3.11, Electric and Magnetic Fields and Noise, pg. 3-272 to 3-279</li> </ul>

<b>GENERAL COMMENT TRACKING INDEX</b>			
	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Summary of Comments Received</b>	<b>DEIS and FEIS Response Index</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Avalanche Hazards</b>	Although this was an issue of great concern during the public scoping for this Project, no comments were received on this issue during review of the DEIS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ No additional information provided in FEIS</li> </ul>
<b>13</b>	<b>Socio-economics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Several comments requested that a cost-benefit analysis that weighs the benefits of the Project with the cost of affected wildlife and habitat be completed for the proposed project.</li> <li>■ Other comments questioned the accuracy of statements that consumers would experience rate savings as a result of the Project.</li> <li>■ Comments were also received on potential impacts to property values.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 13, pg. 1-8</li> <li>■ FEIS, Section 2.2.7, Environmental Cost-Benefit Analysis Summary, pgs. 2-21 to 2-32</li> <li>■ DEIS Section 3.7.2, Socioeconomic Consequences of the Proposed Action, Facility Impacts on Property Values (pg. 3-176)</li> </ul>
<b>14</b>	<b>Alternatives to the Proposed Project</b>	<p>The majority of comments received, almost 23 percent, focused on alternatives to the proposed project. These comments focused on the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Several comments were related to Transmission alternatives to the Enstar Route (Tesoro and Quartz Creek routes),</li> <li>■ Others commented on alternatives to a transmission option,</li> <li>■ Some individuals believe that a transmission line is not needed at all,</li> <li>■ Finally, others suggested that options such as fuel cells should be analyzed more thoroughly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 14, Pg. 1-8 to 1-9</li> <li>■ FEIS, Section 1.3.1, Issue 1, Pgs. 1-3 and 1-4</li> <li>■ FEIS, Section S.10, Agency Preferences and Decisions to be Made</li> <li>■ FEIS, Appendix A, USFWS Compatibility Determination</li> <li>■ FEIS, Appendix B, Draft Section 404(b)(1) Evaluation</li> <li>■ DEIS, Section 2.2, Alternatives Studied and Eliminated from Detailed Study, pg. 2-1 through 2-25</li> </ul>